

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 16, 2010, the Examiner rejects claims 49 and 54-60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants have amended claims 49 and 54-60. No claims have been added. Claims 2-48 were withdrawn from consideration and are canceled to place the Application in a condition suitable for allowance. After entry of this Amendment, claims 49 and 54-60 remain pending in the Application. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 49 and its dependent claims 54-56 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumura et al. (US 6,125,144) in view of Okumura et al. (US 6,414,995). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 49 to correct minor typographical/grammatical errors and to correct antecedent bases. Specifically, claim 49 as amended describes a method of compressing video data having at least one frame having at least one block and each block having an array of pixels, wherein the blocks of a given frame are coded as differences from a similarly sized block in a prior coded frame. The method includes, *inter alia*, selecting a coding mode to encode the current block from a list of coding modes comprising at least the following choices: not using a motion vector at all; using the motion vector of step a); and using the motion vector of step b). The method also includes encoding and transmitting the said choice of coding mode from step c), and transmitting the motion vector from step a) only when it is the choice of coding mode selected to code the current block.

Neither Matsumura et al. nor Okumura et al., either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the feature of selecting a coding mode as set forth in claim 49. Matsumura et al. discloses a picture coding method that, for example, prevents decoding errors found in compressed data by intra-picture coding (or INTRA mode coding) one or more partitions in a frame so that it can be refreshed (i.e. intra-picture coded) in the next frame. (Col. 2, ll. 53-64; Col. 9, ll. 8-13). Specifically, that method refreshes the partitions based on, for example, a calculated temporal change amount such as a position-fixed differential data variance. (Col. 9, ll. 33-41). Matsumura et al. does not disclose selection of coding modes as described in claim 49. Although Matsumura et al. uses the term "coding mode" to refer to INTER mode or

INTRA mode, these coding modes do not indicate which *motion vector* (or if any motion vector) should be used during the coding process as required by step c) of claim 49. The coding modes in Matsumura et al. indicate which *frame* should be used during coding. Specifically, Matsumura et al. teaches that in the INTER coding mode, coding is performed between consecutive frames and in the INTRA coding mode, coding is performed within the same frame. (Col. 1, ll. 13-24). The coding modes in Matsumura et al. are not coding modes selected from a list including not using a motion vector at all, using the motion vector of step a) and using the motion vector of step b). There is no list of coding modes in Matsumura et al. Accordingly, the coding modes described in claim 49 are not equivalent to the coding modes of Matsumura et al.

Further, since Matsumura et al. does not teach or suggest selecting a coding mode, Matsumura et al. also does not teach encoding and transmitting the selected coding mode and transmitting the current motion vector only when the second coding mode is selected as set forth in claim 49.

Okumura et al. does not remedy any of these deficiencies in Matsumura et al. Okumura et al. discloses a motion vector detector system that includes, for example, a predicted motion vector calculator that predicts a motion vector for a block based upon reference blocks adjacent to the block to be predicted. (Claim 8). Based upon this predicted motion vector, a search range is determined in a reference frame. (*Id.*) Since a motion vector is obtained for the blocks of a frame, from the motion vector calculator, there is no selection of coding modes from a list including not using a motion vector at all, using the motion vector of step a) and using the motion vector of step b). Accordingly, Okumura et al. does not teach or suggest selecting a coding mode as set forth in claim 49.

Since Matsumura et al. and Okumura et al. do not teach or suggest all the features of claim 49, either alone or in combination, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 49 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 54-56 and 58 have been amended to correct minor typographical/grammatical errors, to correct antecedent bases and to conform to the amendments made in claim 49. Claim 56 has also been amended to correct its dependency. Claim 57 has also been amended to clarify that the "block above has a motion vector but the block to the left does

not." Claim 58 has also been amended for clarity by changing the language to "differentially encoding the motion vector of step a) from" so that it conforms with the language used in claim 57. Based on at least their dependency from claim 49, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 54-56 and 58 are also allowable.

The Examiner also rejects dependent claims 57, 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumura et al. in view of Okumura et al.¹ and further in view of Mukerjee et al. (US 7,116,831) and Wu et al. (US 6,418,166). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matsumura et al. nor Okumura et al., either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the combination of features of claim 49, from which claims 57, 59 and 60 depend, as previously described. The Examiner has neither cited Mukerjee et al. nor Wu et al. for teaching or suggesting the missing features of claim 49 (discussed previously in connection with Matsumura et al. and Okumura et al.). Applicants have reviewed these references and do not find that Mukerjee et al. nor Wu et al. teach or suggest these missing features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Mukerjee et al. nor Wu et al. cures the deficiencies in the combination of Matsumura et al. and Okumura et al. described above with respect to claim 49 and thus, claims 57, 59 and 60 are allowable over the cited references at least based on their dependency from claim 49.

It is submitted that this Amendment has antecedent basis in the Application as originally filed, including the specification, claims and drawings, and that this Amendment does not add any new subject matter to the Application. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is requested. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment places the Application in suitable condition for allowance; notice of which is requested.

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present Application can be expedited by way of an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

¹ Although the Examiner has not cited Okumura et al. for rejecting dependent claims 57, 59 and 60, Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to cite Okumura et al. to reject these claims because of their dependency from claim 49.

YOUNG BASILE HANLON &
MACFARLANE, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Mustafa', written over the printed name.

Nadine N. Mustafa
Registration No. 59755
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Ste. 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107